



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/691,261

10/22/2003

Ian D. Gaston

200901405-1

5449

22879 7590 09/08/2009

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY

Intellectual Property Administration

3404 E. Harmony Road

Mail Stop 35

FORT COLLINS, CO 80528

EXAMINER

CARTER, CANDICE D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3629

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/08/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM

ipa.mail@hp.com

jessica.l.fusek@hp.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/691,261	Applicant(s) GASTON ET AL.	
	Examiner CANDICE D. CARTER	Art Unit 3629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-7,9-12 and 14-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-7,9-12 and 14-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is a First Action Non-Final on the merits. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 10-12, and 15 have been amended. Claims 3, 8, and 13 have been cancelled. Claims 16-21 have been added. Therefore, claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-12, and 14-21 are currently pending and have been considered below.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 26, 2009 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1, 2, and 5-7, 10-12, and 15-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Falso et al. (2003/0125965) Wolff et al. (5,774,887) and further in view of Hitchcock et al. (6,4460,042).**

As per claim 1, Falso et al. discloses "A method for standardizing reporting of issues, assumptions, and risks for a risk review board, the method comprising:

Presenting, via the computer system, with a form for entering information about risk management units including assumptions, risks, issues, and risk plans; receiving, via the computer system, the information about a risk management unit" (§ 27 and Fig. 2 disclose a display page used to collect information about a risk management contract, where the display page presents a form for entering the information);

"providing to a user a form via the computer system, the form having entry areas for every element needed to properly adhere to a risk management scheme" (Fig. 2 displays entry fields for elements needed for the risk management contract).

"entering via the computer system information needed to properly adhere to a risk management scheme, the information including at least a name of a risk owner, an explanation of how the risk came about, a driver of the risk, a milestone of the risk, the last possible start date for action to take place to avoid the impact of the risk, the criticality of the risk, the controllability of the risk, what actions have been taken to-date with respect to the risk, one or more actions that have been identified to prevent the risk from occurring, and the cost of any action" (§ 34 and 35 disclose name fields and positions fields for identifying the name and organizational position of the person with responsibility for the selected contract, where the individual responsible for the contract is the individual that is responsible for the risks associated with the contract [risk owner])

Falso et al., however, fails to explicitly disclose "hindering via the computer system the user from exiting the form prior to supplying appropriate information necessary for adherence to the risk management scheme".

Wolff et al. discloses a customer service electronic form generating system "hindering the user from exiting the form prior to supplying all information" (col. 8, line 26-40 discloses that the system determines whether the form is complete before the user can exit from the existing form into the next uncompleted form).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing contractual risk of Falso et al. to include the hindering of a user from exiting a form as taught by Wolff et al. in order ensure that a user has entered all pertinent information before exiting the form.

Hitchcock et al. discloses a universal forms engine that checks to make sure that appropriate information is supplied to the forms (col. 14, line 63-col. 15, line 5 discloses data validation that checks the validity of the information that is in the fields of the form, where checking the validity is checking that the information is valid and appropriate for the particular fields being used).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing contractual risk of Falso et al. to include checking the validity/appropriateness of the data in the fields of the form as taught by Hitchcock in order to ensure that all data meets the criteria of the data that is requested by the specific form fields. The specific information that is

Art Unit: 3629

entered in the form does not change the function of the claimed invention. Examiner asserts that the method of the Falso, Wolff, and Hitchcock combination is fully capable of providing a form that is capable of receiving any type of information.

Furthermore, Examiner considers that specific information being entered into the form presented by the computer system to be nonfunctional descriptive material

Claims 6 and 11 recite equivalent limitations to claim 1 and are, therefore, rejected using the same art and rationale as set forth above.

As per claim 2, Falso et al. further discloses “generating a report in a standardized format based on the information about the risk” (¶ 21 discloses generating a risk report which includes the information about the risk contract and Fig. 5 displays a sample risk report that is generated in a standardized format).

Claims 7 and 12 recite equivalent limitations to claim 2 and are, therefore, rejected using the same art and rationale as set forth above.

As per claim 5, Falso et al. discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose “the step of hindering the user from exiting the form prior to supplying appropriate information necessary for adherence to the risk management scheme comprises preventing the user from exiting an entry field until the user has provided an entry for the entry field”.

Wolff et al. discloses a customer service electronic form generating system “preventing the user from exiting an entry field until the user has provided an entry for the entry field” (col. 9, line 37-47 discloses that the system determines whether the

Art Unit: 3629

customer service representative has completed the current field before allowing the customer to move onto the next fields).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the method and system for managing contractual risk of Falso et al. to include the step of hindering a user from exiting a field before completing it as taught by Wolff et al. in order to ensure that a user has entered all pertinent information before exiting the field.

Hitchcock et al. discloses a universal forms engine that checks to make sure that appropriate information is supplied to the forms (col. 14, line 63-col. 15, line 5 discloses data validation that checks the validity of the information that is in the fields of the form, where checking the validity is checking that the information is valid and appropriate for the particular fields being used).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for managing contractual risk of Falso et al. to include checking the validity/appropriateness of the data in the fields of the form as taught by Hitchcock in order to ensure that all data meets the criteria of the data that is requested by the specific form fields.

Claims 10 and 15 recite equivalent limitations to claim 5 and are, therefore, rejected using the same art and rationale as set forth above.

Examiner considers claims 16-21 to be nonfunctional descriptive material. The specific information that is entered in the form does not change the function of the claimed invention. Examiner asserts that the method of the Falso, Wolff, and Hitchcock

Art Unit: 3629

combination is fully capable of providing a form that is capable of receiving any type of information.

5. Claims 4, 9, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Falso et al. in view of Wolff et al. in view of Hitchcock and further in view of Engert et al. (1999).

As per claim 4, Falso et al. further discloses a risk management scheme (§ 19 discloses a system for managing risk factors, where this system is a risk management scheme).

Falso, however, fails to explicitly disclose an ABCD risk management scheme, wherein at least one of the letters of “A”, “B”, “C”, and “D” are ascribed to a determined level of risk.

Engert et al. discloses a risk matrix user’s guide having a risk management scheme that ascribes letters to a determined level of risk (see page 16).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the method and system for managing contractual risk of the Falso et al., Wolff et al., and Hitchcock et al. combination to include a risk management scheme ascribing letters to a determined level of risk as taught by Engert in order to easily measure/identify risk type and severity.

Furthermore, Examiner considers the specific characters/letters that are ascribed to be nonfunctional. The specific letters, characters, or notations being used to identify risk levels does not change the function of the claimed invention.

Claims 9 and 14 recites equivalent limitations to claim 4 and are, therefore, rejected using the same art and rationale as set forth above.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-12, and 14-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CANDICE D. CARTER whose telephone number is (571) 270-5105. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday 7:30am- 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on (571) 272-6812. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/691,261
Art Unit: 3629

Page 9

/C. D. C./
Examiner, Art Unit 3629

/JOHN G. WEISS/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3629